



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

64
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,312	12/19/2000	John E. Maloney	PA000190	5034

23696 7590 07/13/2005

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

CUMMING, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,312

Applicant(s)

MALONEY & SWAZEY

Examiner

WILLIAM D CUMMING

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3,8-10 and 16-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,11-15 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 is confusing since the parent claim 12 states that the first and second input device are separate by claim 13 says they are the same. It cannot be both at the same time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 12 and 13, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Tanagawa, et al.**

Tanagawa, et al disclose a method and system of parallel programming an electronic device's memory (figures 1 and 6, #17) with test code and system code prior board level testing during manufacturing (column 1, line 55 to column 2, line 30, etc.). The method and system comprising the steps and means of programming the electronic device (#1) with first instructions and second instructions (figure 5).

The first instructions comprise a test code for use during board level testing and the second instructions comprise partial system code for system level testing the electronic device (#1, column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 5, etc). Executing the first instruction during board level testing of the electronic device (#1) to determine the condition of the electronic device (#1) independent of the second instructions (column 5, line 31-45, etc.). Programming the electronic device (#1) to determine the condition of the electronic device (#1) independent of the second instructions (column 5, line 34-54, etc.) and executing the second and third instructions during system level testing of the electronic device.

Regarding the fourth instructions, note column 2, line 56 to column 3, line 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicants are advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 4, 6, 14, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanagawa, et al**.

Tanagawa, et al disclose all subject matter, note the above paragraphs, except for flash memory, flash RAM, and U/I codes (or UI codes). Flash memory or flash memory RAM are very well known in the art and not invented by applicants, for electronic devices. The examiner takes Official notice as such. Hence, it would have been very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to incorporate the old and well know use of either a flash memory or flash RAM in the **Tanagawa, et al** in order to erase the memory of **Tanagawa, et al's** electronic device for reprogramming at a future date.

Regarding the UI codes, UI codes are used by such companies like AT&T, Sun, UNISYS and Fujitsu for years now and is standard software for UNIX type systems and not invented by applicants. UI codes are well known in the art and the Examiner takes Official notice as such. Hence, it would have been very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to incorporate the old and well know use of UI codes in order for the electronic device of **Tanagawa, et al** to be programmed and communicate with UNIX type of systems.

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well known statement during examination, then the object of the well known statement is taken to be admitted prior art. *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943). A seasonable challenge constitutes a demand for evidence made as soon as practicable during prosecution. Thus, applicant is charged with rebutting the well known statement in the next reply after the Office action in which the well known statement was made.

Response to Amendment**9. Updated Notice of Centralized Delivery and Facsimile Transmission Policy for Patent Related Correspondence, and Exceptions Thereto**

On December 1, 2003, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) established a “*centralized delivery*” policy for patent related correspondence to enable the Office to promptly scan the correspondence into the Office’s image file wrapper (IFW) system. The “*centralized delivery*” policy requires most patent related correspondence to be: a) faxed to the central facsimile number ((703) 872-9306), b) hand carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), or c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in 37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450).i The “*centralized delivery*” policy was revised in three follow-up notices. In order to provide further updated information, and to provide a single comprehensive statement of the Office’s current “*centralized delivery*” policy, this notice is issued. This notice replaces all prior Office notices specifying a specific fax number or hand carry address for certain patent related correspondence.

General “*Centralized Delivery*” Policy:

For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window, and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the central facsimile number ((703) 872-9306), unless an exception, as noted below, applies. Exceptions to the general policy of “*centralized delivery*” generally involve situations where special handling of the patent related correspondence is

available. All the current exceptions are listed in this notice. Correspondence which is not related to a specific patent or patent application, such as a question on policy, on employment, or other general inquiry, is not covered by this notice. Below are two lists which set forth all the current exceptions to the "*centralized delivery*" policy. The first list covers the exceptions for certain hand carried items, and the second list covers the exceptions for certain facsimile transmitted items. Both lists reflect the relocation of most USPTO operations to the Alexandria, Virginia campus.

List I – Exceptions for Certain Hand Carried Correspondence Current exceptions:

Only the following types of correspondence may be delivered (hand-carried) to the specific location provided below instead of the Customer Service Window. If correspondence listed below is carried to the Customer Service Window, the correspondence will be accepted and routed to the appropriate office.

1. Access Requests:

Requests for access to patent application files may continue to be hand carried to the File Information Unit (FIU) in Room 2E04, 2900 Crystal Drive (South Tower), Arlington VA 22202. Requests for access to patent application files that are maintained in the Image File Wrapper system and that have not yet been published may also be hand carried to the Public Search Facility on the 1st floor of the Madison East building, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria VA 22314.

2. Patent Term Extensions under 35 U.S.C. § 156:

Patent term extension applications under 35 U.S.C. 156 (Hatch/Waxman) may be hand-carried to the Office of Patent Legal Administration (OPLA) in Room 07D85, 600 Dulany Street (Madison West building), Alexandria VA 22314. At the guard station in Madison West (near the elevators), the security guard should call the OPLA at either (571) 272-7744 or (571) 272-7746 for delivery assistance.

3. Assignments to be Recorded:

Assignments may be hand-carried to the Office of Public Records Customer Service Window on the 2nd floor of the South Tower building, 2900 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA 22202.

4. Office of General Counsel:

Correspondence for the Office of General Counsel may be hand-carried to the Office of General Counsel in Room 10C20, 600 Dulany Street (Madison East building), Alexandria VA 22314. At the guard station in Madison East (near the elevators), the security guard should call the Office of General Counsel at 571-272-7000 for delivery assistance.

5. Solicitor's Office:

Correspondence for the Solicitor's Office may be hand-carried to the Solicitor's Office in Room 8C43, 600 Dulany Street

(Madison West building), Alexandria VA 22314. At the guard station in Madison West (near the elevators), the security guard should call the Solicitor's Office at 571-272-9035 for delivery assistance.

6. Interference related correspondence:

Correspondence relating to interferences may be hand-carried to the 1st floor lobby of Madison East building, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria VA 22314, where a drop-off box for hand-carried documents to be filed with the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is located. Customers need to pass through the magnetometer and have the materials passed through the x-ray sensors before placing them in the drop-off box. The drop-off box is for Interference related correspondence **ONLY**. Boxes are not permitted in the drop-off box. Boxed materials should be hand-carried to Madison East, Room 9B55-A using the following procedures. At either guard station (concourse level or 1st floor) in Madison East (near the elevators), the security guard should call the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797 to obtain authorization to allow entry into the building for delivery to Room 9B55-A. Access to Room 9B55-A is available from 8:30 AM to 4:45 PM only. Documents/boxes hand-carried to the drop-off box or to Room 9B55-A after 4:45 PM (EST) will receive the next day's filing date. Customers desiring a stamped return receipt for their

filing need to personally bring their filing and postcard to Room 9B55-A during the hours stated above, or leave the postcard with the filing (postcard must include correct postage mail stamp and the address where the postcard it to be mailed). The Board will stamp the filing date and mail the postcard to the customer.

7. Secrecy Order:

Applications subject to a secrecy order pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 181, or are national security classified, and correspondence related thereto, may be hand-carried to the Licensing and Review location. See 37 CFR Secs. 5.1(c) and 5.2(c). Licensing and review is expected to relocate to the Alexandria campus on April 1, 2005. Effective April 1, 2005, the Licensing and Review location is:

Technology Center 3600, Room 4B31, 501 Dulany Street (Knox building), Alexandria VA 22314.

At the guard station in Knox (near the elevators), the security guard should call Licensing and Review at (571) 272-8203 for delivery assistance. Prior to April 1, 2005, the Licensing and Review location is:

Technology Center 3600, Office of the Director, 2451 Crystal Drive (Crystal Park 5 building), Room 3D07
Arlington, VA 22202.

8. Explicit Foreign Filing License Petitions:

Effective April 1, 2005, petitions for foreign filing license pursuant to 37 CFR 5.12(b) for which expedited handling is requested and petitions for retroactive license under 37 CFR 5.25, may be hand-carried to Licensing and Review in Room 4B41, 501 Dulany Street (Knox building), Alexandria VA 22314. At the guard station in Knox (near the elevators), the security guard should call Licensing and Review at (571) 272-8187 for delivery assistance.

9. Petitions to Withdraw from Issue:

Petitions to Withdraw from Issue may be hand carried to the Office of Petitions on the 7th floor of the Madison West building, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria VA 22314. At the guard station in Madison West (near the elevators), the security guard should call the Office of Petitions at (571) 272-3282 for delivery assistance. Hand carried papers will be accepted between the hours of 8:30 a.m. until 3:45 p.m.

10. Documents requested by the Office of Patent

Publication:

Documents requested by the Office of Patent

Publication may be hand carried to the Office of Patent

Publication in Room 8A24, 2900 Crystal Drive (South Tower building), Arlington VA 22202, during business hours.

Elimination of certain previously authorized exceptions:

Hand carry delivery to a location other than the Customer Service Window is no longer permitted for the following types of correspondence:

- (1) correspondence relating to PCT international applications prior to national stage entry (35 U.S.C. 371) [Note: as of January 14, 2005, there no longer is a separate PCT Operations Customer Window];
- (2) petitions for express abandonment to avoid publication under 37 CFR 1.138(c);
- (3) requests to initiate, or related to on-going, ex parte or inter partes reexamination proceedings;
- (4) design patent applications with a corresponding request for expedited examination under 37 CFR 1.155; and (5) correspondence for the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (OED).

List II -Exceptions for Certain Facsimile Transmitted Correspondence For each Office location listed below, only the particular type of correspondence indicated may be transmitted to the specific facsimile number at that Office location. All other types of facsimile transmitted correspondence must be sent to the central facsimile number ((703) 872-9306).

1. Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) Request for corrected Filing

Receipt:

(703) 746-9195 facsimile number

Response to Notice to File Missing Parts:

(703) 746-4060 facsimile number

Note: New applications, correspondence being submitted for the purpose of obtaining an application filing date, and color drawings may NOT be transmitted by facsimile. OIPE Customer Service telephone number: (703) 308-1202

2. PCT Operations and PCT Legal Administration Correspondence

subsequent to filing in an international application before the U.S. Receiving Office, the U.S. International Searching Authority, or the U.S. International Examining Authority:

Papers in international applications:

(703) 305-3230 facsimile number

Response to Decisions on Petition:

(571) 273-0459 facsimile number

Note: An international application for patent or a copy of the international application and the basic national fee necessary to enter the national stage, as specified in 37 CFR 1.495(b), may NOT be submitted by facsimile. See 37 CFR 1.6(d)(3) (referencing 37 CFR 1.8(a)(2)(i)(D) and (F)). Subsequent

correspondence may be transmitted by facsimile in an application before the U.S. Receiving Office, the U.S. International Searching Authority, or the U.S. International Examining Authority, but it will **NOT** receive the benefit of any certificate of transmission (or mailing). See 37 CFR 1.8(a)(2) (i)(E).

Correspondence during national stage, subsequent to entry, are handled in the same manner as a U.S. national application.

The PCT Help Desk:

(571) 273-0419 facsimile number (703) 305-3257 telephone number

3. Office of Patent Publication Payment of an issue fee and any required publication fee by authorization to charge a deposit account or credit card, and drawings:

(703) 746-4000 facsimile number

Note: Although submission of drawings by facsimile may reduce the quality of the drawings, the Office will generally print the drawings as received. Office of Patent Publication telephone numbers to check on receipt of payment: (703) 308-6789 or 1-888-786-0101

4. Office of Pre-Grant Publication Petitions for express abandonment to avoid publication under 37 CFR 1.138(c), and Requests for express abandonment under 37 CFR 1.138: (703) 305-8568 facsimile number

Pre-Grant Publication Division telephone number for questions relating to the publication of patent applications:

(703) 605-4283. Questions may also be directed by e-mail to
pgpub@uspto.gov.

5. Electronic Business Center (EBC) Requests for Customer Number Data
Change (PTO/SB/124), and Requests for a Customer Number (PTO/SB/125):

(703) 308-2840 facsimile number.

Note: The EBC may also be reached by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov.

EBC telephone number for customer service and assistance:

(866) 217-9197

6. Assignment Branch Assignments or other documents affecting title:

(703) 306-5995 facsimile number

Note: Customers may submit documents directly into the automated
Patent and Trademark Assignment System and receive the resulting recordation
notice at their facsimile machine. (Assignment documents submitted through the
Electronic Patent Assignment System also permits the recordation notice to be
faxed to customers.) Credit card payments to record assignment documents are
now accepted, and use of the Credit Card form (PTO-2038) is required for the
credit card information to be separated from the assignment records. Only
documents with an identified patent application or patent number, a single cover
sheet to record a single type of transaction, and the fee paid by an authorization
to charge a USPTO deposit account or credit card may be submitted via
facsimile. Please refer to the USPTO Web Site, at

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/ac/ido/opr/ptasfax.pdf> for more information regarding the submission of assignment documents via facsimile.

Assignment Branch telephone number for assistance:

(703) 308-9723 7.

Central Reexamination Unit (CRU) *Inter partes* reexamination correspondence, except for the initial request: (571) 273-0100 facsimile number

Note: All *ex parte* reexamination correspondence, except for the initial request, may be sent by facsimile transmission to the central facsimile number. Correspondence related to reexamination proceedings will be separately scanned in the CRU.

CRU telephone number for customer service and inquiries: (571) 272-7705 8.

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Correspondence related to pending interferences permitted to be transmitted by facsimile (only where expressly authorized, see 37 CFR 1.6(d)(9)):

(571) 273-0042 facsimile number

Note: Correspondence should not be transmitted to this number if an interference has not yet been declared.

9. Office of the General Counsel Correspondence permitted to be transmitted to the Office of General Counsel:

(571) 273-0099 facsimile number

10. Office of the Solicitor Correspondence permitted to be transmitted by facsimile to the Office of the Solicitor:

(571) 273-0373 facsimile number

11. Licensing and Review Petitions for a foreign filing license pursuant to 37 CFR 5.12(b), including a petition for a foreign filing license where there is no corresponding U.S. application (37 CFR 5.13):

(571) 273-0185 facsimile number (if the fax is transmitted on or after April 1, 2005) (703) 305-7658 facsimile number (if the fax is transmitted prior to April 1, 2005)

Note: Correspondence to be filed in a patent application subject to a secrecy order under 37 CFR Sec. 5.1 through 5.5 and directly related to the secrecy order content of the application may **NOT** be transmitted via facsimile.
See 37 CFR Sec. 1.6(d)(6).

12. Office of Petitions Petitions to Withdraw from Issue:

(571) 273-0025 facsimile number

Note: All other types of petitions must be directed to the Central Facsimile Number ((703) 872-9306). Any paper other than a Petition to Withdraw from Issue which is sent to the Office of Petitions fax number (instead of the Central Facsimile Number) will be discarded. Petitions sent to the Central Facsimile Number should be marked "Special Processing Submission".

Questions regarding this notice may be e-mailed to **PatentPractice@uspto.gov**, or directed to the Inventors' Assistance Center by telephone at (800)786-9199, or (703)308-4357. 3/2/05

10. Termination of the Waiver of Provisions of 37 CFR 1.8 and 1.10 for Correspondence Intended for the United States Patent and Trademark Office but Addressed to Washington, DC 20231

Effective on April 4, 2005, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.8 (Certificate of Mailing) and 1.10 ("Express Mail") will no longer be waived for correspondence addressed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Washington, DC 20231. On May 1, 2003, the USPTO changed its address for certain correspondence to P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. See 37 CFR 1.1 and *Correspondence with the United States Patent and Trademark Office*, 68 Fed. Reg. 14332 (March 25, 2003), 1269 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 159 (Apr. 22, 2003). To allow applicants time to become accustomed to the new address in Alexandria, VA, the USPTO waived the provisions of 37 CFR 1.8 and 1.10 such that correspondence addressed to Washington, DC 20231 would be treated as acceptable under 37 CFR 1.8 and 1.10 for otherwise compliant Certificates of Mailing and "Express Mail." The United States Postal Service (USPS) has ceased forwarding to the USPTO correspondence addressed to Washington, DC 20231. Additionally, the USPTO will no longer arrange for the delivery to Alexandria, VA of correspondence addressed to Washington, DC 20231 after April 3, 2005. Thus, after April 3, 2005, all correspondence addressed to the Washington, DC 20231 address will be returned to sender marked by the USPS as undeliverable. Such mail returned to the

sender by the USPS will not be considered proof of prior filing or mailing under 37 CFR 1.8(b) or 1.10(e) since the correspondence was not mailed in accordance with 37 CFR 1.1. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.1, correspondence intended for the USPTO must be mailed to P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, except as otherwise provided.

1. Correspondence intended for the USPTO, unless directed otherwise, must be addressed to: Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

2. Correspondence in patent-related matters to organizations reporting to the Commissioner for Patents must be addressed to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

3. Correspondence in trademark-related matters, except documents sent to the Assignment Services Division for recordation, requests for copies of trademark documents, and documents directed to the Madrid Processing Unit, must be addressed to: Commissioner for Trademarks P.O. Box 1451 Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

The above addresses are the USPTO's three general mailing addresses for mail delivered by the USPS; however, the USPTO has separate mailing addresses for certain correspondence as set forth in the notice titled "*Mailing and Hand Carry Addresses for Mail to the United States Patent and Trademark Office*" (formerly, "*Special Mail Stops For Patent Mail*") that is published each week in the Official Gazette Notices and posted on the USPTO Internet web site. Questions regarding this notice may be e-mailed to PatentPractice@uspto.gov, or directed to the Inventors' Assistance

Center (formerly the Patent Assistance Center (PAC)) by telephone at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357. Date: 3/1/05

Claim Objections

11. Claims 4 and 6 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicants are required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. It has been held that to be entitled to weight in method claims, the recited structure limitations therein must affect the method in a manipulative sense, and not to amount to the mere claiming of a use or not the use of a particular structure. *Ex parte Pfeiffer*, 1962 C.D. 408 (1961). The dependent claims fail to claim a further steps, hence it fails to limit the method of the previous claim.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed May 19, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Anticipatory reference need not duplicate, word for word, what is in claims; anticipation can occur when claimed limitation is "*inherent*" or otherwise implicit in relevant reference (Standard Havens Products Incorporated v. Gencor Industries Incorporated, 21 USPQ2d 1321).

During examination before the Patent and Trademark Office, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and **limitations from the specification may not be imputed to the claims** (*Ex parte Akamatsu*, 22 USPQ2d, 1918; *In re Zletz*, 13 USPQ2d 1320, *In re Priest*, 199 USPQ 11). In response to Applicants' argument, the law of anticipation requires that a distinction be made between the invention described or taught and the invention claimed. It does not require that the reference "*teach*" what the subject patent teaches. Assuming that a reference is properly "*prior art*," it is only necessary that the claims under consideration "*read on*" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference, or "*fully met*" by it. It was held in *In re Donohue*, 226 USPQ 619, that, "*It is well settled that prior art under 35 USC §102(b) must sufficiently describe the claimed invention to have placed the public in possession of it... Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the art could have combine the description of the invention with his own knowledge to make the claimed invention.*" Clear inference to the artisan must be considered, *In re Preda*, 159 USPQ 342. A prior art reference must be considered together with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, *In re Samour*, 197 USPQ 1. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "*given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.*"

Claim term is not limited to single embodiment disclosed in specification, since number of embodiments disclosed does not determine meaning of the claim term, and applicants cannot overcome "*heavy presumption*" that term takes on its ordinary meaning simply by pointing to preferred embodiment (Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp., CA FC, 6/21/02, 63 USPQ2d 1374). **Applicants always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified.** In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA1969). "*Arguments that the alleged anticipatory prior art is nonanalogous art' or teaches away from the invention' or is not recognized as solving the problem solved by the claimed invention, [are] not germane' to a rejection under section 102.*" Twin Disc, Inc. v. United States, 231 USPQ 417, 424 (Cl. Ct. 1986) (quoting In re Self, 671 F.2d 1344, 213 USPQ 1, 7 (CCPA 1982)). A reference is no less anticipatory if, after disclosing the invention, the reference then disparages it. The question whether a reference "*teaches away*" from the invention is inapplicable to an anticipation analysis. Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp., 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir.1998).

In response to applicants' argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., minimize programming, set up burden, consumer-specific preference information, phone number, speed dialing, ring volume, phone system features, etc.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The specification is not the measure of the invention. Therefore, limitations contained therein can not be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art (*In re Sporck*, 155 USPQ 687). **Attempt to invoke limitations present in the preferred embodiment but absent from the claims themselves violates the established claim construction principles.**

Applicants' attorney states that Tanagawa does not disclose a portable electronic device, but if applicants' attorney takes the time to actually read the claims, neither does the claims.

In response to applicants' arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references or what is well known in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Whether the claims do, in fact, set out and circumscribe a particular area with reasonable degree of precision and particularity, definiteness of claim language is analyzed, not in a vacuum, but always in light of the teachings of the prior art and of the particular application disclosure as it would be interpreted by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art (*in re Moore*, 169 USPQ 236). Reference to the specification disclosure or prior art teachings may make an otherwise definite claim take on an unreasonable degree of uncertainty (*In re Cohen*, 169 USPQ 45; *In re Hammack*, 166 USPQ 204; *In re Anderson*, 176 USPQ 331).

If the scope of the invention sought to be patented cannot be determined from the language of the claims, a second paragraph rejection is appropriate (In re Wiggins, 179 USPQ 421). The examiner is dismayed that applicants' attorney does not comprehend that claim 13 incorporates all the limitations of claim 12. Claim 13 claims that the inputs are separate and the same at the same time. It cannot be both. If you have a single input or the same input, you cannot have a first and second input.

Regarding objections under 37 CFR 1.75, the examiner cited legal precedence for foundation for his objections, where is applicants' attorney legal precedence to back up his argument? So far Applicants' attorney failed to submit one or specifically point out in the dependent claims a further step. Hence it fails to limit the method of the previous claim.

It is respectfully submitted that this application is **NOT** in condition for allowance and allowance is **DENIED**.

Conclusion

13. Replacement Notice: Copies of Patent Application Records will be Provided in both Electronic and Paper Form

The Official Gazette notice, published on August 24, 2004 entitled "*All Electronic Copies of Patent Application Records Will Now Be Provided as Certified Copies in Electronic Form*" (1285 Off. Gaz. Pat. Off, August 24, 2004) is hereby rescinded. The USPTO is reinstating, until further notice, the procedures in effect prior to July 30, 2004 for providing certified copies of patent application records with paper certification statements. The USPTO will also offer electronic certified copies of patent application records at the requester's option.

Certified Copies with Paper Certification

Unless otherwise requested, certified copies of patent application records provided pursuant to 37 CFR 1.19 (b) will be produced with a paper certification statement, continuing the practice in effect prior to July 30, 2004. The certification statement will include an embossed seal and original signature.

Certified Copies with Electronic Certification

Customers ordering certified copies of patent applications as filed or patent-related file wrapper and contents of published applications from the USPTO website will have the option to choose electronic copies with electronic certification. These files include an imaged certification statement as part of a PDF file containing the document TIFF images. These electronic files are digitally signed by the USPTO for authenticity and integrity, and cannot be undetectably modified. Customers may choose to download these electronic files from the USPTO website or receive them on compact disc.

Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and Priority

Irrespective of whether the USPTO provides a paper certified copy or an electronic certified copy, Article 4(d)(3) of the Paris Convention prohibits any country that is a member of the convention from requiring further authentication of the certified copy for purposes of claiming priority under the Paris Convention. (The text of the Paris Convention and a list of its members are available at www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/paris/index.html.)

The USPTO is working with other intellectual property offices to encourage the acceptance of priority documents in electronic form with electronic certification. A list of offices and international intellectual property organizations that have agreed to accept electronic certified copies will be posted on the USPTO website soon, and updated regularly.

Questions should be directed to the Office of Public Records by email to opr@uspto.gov or by telephone at (703) 308-9743.

14. If applicants wish to request for an interview, an "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form (PTOL-413A) should be submitted to the examiner prior to the interview in order to permit the examiner to prepare in advance for the interview and to focus on the issues to be discussed. This form should identify the participants of the interview, the proposed date of the interview, whether the interview will be personal, telephonic, or video conference, and should include a brief description of the issues to be discussed. A copy of the completed "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form should be attached to the Interview Summary form, PTOL-413 at the completion of the interview and a copy should be given to applicant or applicant's representative.

15. If applicants request an interview after this **final rejection**, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing. Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to **restate arguments** of record or to **discuss new limitations** which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

16. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 enacted on December 8, 2004

H.R. 4818, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Consolidated Appropriations Act) was signed by President George W. Bush and enacted into law on December 8, 2004. The Consolidated Appropriations Act revises certain patent application and maintenance fees; provides separate fees for a basic filing fee, a search fee, and an examination fee; and requires an additional fee for any patent application whose specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (application size fee). The new patent fees are now effective and will remain in effect during the remainder of fiscal year 2005 and during fiscal year 2006. The patent maintenance fee changes apply to any maintenance fee payment made on or after December 8, 2004, regardless of the filing or issue date of the patent for which the fee is submitted. The revised maintenance fees took effect on December 8, 2004. Thus, any maintenance fee paid at any time on (or after) December 8, 2004 is subject to the revised maintenance fee amounts set forth in the Consolidated Appropriations Act.

Note: If you are paying via the USPTO's Internet Web site, there will likely be a delay in updating the maintenance-fee information on the USPTO's Office of Finance On-Line Shopping Web page. Therefore, if paying on-line, please refer to the updated fee schedule to ensure that you include the appropriate updated fee amount. Maintenance fees must be timely paid in the appropriate amount to avoid expiration of a patent.

The new basic filing fee (or national fee), search fee, examination fee, and application size fee apply to national patent applications (other than provisional applications) filed on or after December 8, 2004, and to international patent applications in which the basic national fee is paid on or after December 8, 2004. The new provisional application filing fee applies to any provisional application filing fee paid on or after December 8, 2004. The filing fee (or national fee), search fee, and examination fee are due on filing. If the filing fee (or national fee) is paid on filing, but the search fee and/or examination fee is missing, the USPTO will issue a notice requiring that any missing search fee and examination fee (but no surcharge until further notice) be paid within a specified period of time in order to avoid abandonment. Thus, if at least the full basic filing fee under the Consolidated Appropriations Act is paid on or after December 8, 2004, the USPTO will issue a notice requiring any balance of the search fee and the examination fee (but no surcharge).

The remaining patent application fee changes, including the excess claims fees, extension of time fees, and appeal fees, apply to any fee payment made on or after December 8, 2004, regardless of the filing date of the application for which the fee is submitted.

USPTO customers should monitor the USPTO's Internet Web site frequently for current patent fee information.

Payments from foreign countries must be payable and immediately negotiable in the United States for the full amount of the fee required.


17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM D CUMMING** whose telephone number is 571-272-7861. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday & Wednesday, 10:30am to 8:30pm,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


WILLIAM D CUMMING
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2683

Wdc
/



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

William Cumming
Primary Patent Examiner
William.Cumming@uspto.gov